



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/537,339	06/02/2005	Mayumi Kotani	8156/84352	3456
42798	7590	06/26/2009	EXAMINER	
FITCH, EVEN, TABIN & FLANNERY			HOFFMAN, SUSAN COE	
P. O. BOX 18415				
WASHINGTON, DC 20036			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1655	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/26/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/537,339	KOTANI ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Susan Coe Hoffman	1655	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 April 2009.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 29-33 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 31 and 33 is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 29,30 and 32 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
     1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
     2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
     3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .                                    |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .                        |

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on April 20, 2009 has been entered.

2. Claims 24-28 have been cancelled in this response.

3. The numbering of claims is not in accordance with 37 CFR 1.126 which requires the original numbering of the claims to be preserved throughout the prosecution. When claims are canceled, the remaining claims must not be renumbered. When new claims are presented, they must be numbered consecutively beginning with the number next following the highest numbered claims previously presented (whether entered or not).

Misnumbered claim 32 been renumbered as claim 33.

4. Claims 29-33 have been added in this response and are currently pending.

***Election/Restrictions***

5. In response to the restriction requirement of September 26, 2006, applicant elected Group V, drawn to a method of enhancing blood antioxidant activity in a subject. This election was made with traverse. Group V was originally claim 21 and is now claims 29, 30 and 32. The claims to the other groups of invention were cancelled in the amendment filed July 13, 2007. In this current response, applicant has amended the claims to reintroduce claims that would have been included in the non-elected Groups of invention if they had been presented originally.

Claim 31 would have been grouped with Group I drawn to a composition, and claim 33 would have been grouped with Group III drawn to a method of suppressing or lowering TBARS levels. Thus, these claims are considered to be non-elected because these claims belong to groups that were not elected by the applicant in the response filed October 16, 2006.

6. In the reply filed on August 11, 2008, applicant elected broccoli for species A, cabbage for species B and astaxanthin for species C. In the current amendment, applicant has amended the claims to require all of the species for categories A and B. Thus, the search is extended to cover all of these species.

7. Claims 31 and 33 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim.

8. Claims 29, 30 and 32 are examined on the merits.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

9. Claim 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. This claim is indefinite because the antecedent basis for "the raw vegetables" is unclear. In addition, it is unclear what is meant by the phrase "calculated as the raw vegetables."

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

10. Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Suido (Agricultural and Food Chemistry (April 2002), vol. 50, pp. 3346-3350).

The reference teaches a method of administering a juice composition to a patient. The composition comprises broccoli, cabbage, spinach, parsley, komatsuna, Japanese radish leaves, lettuce and celery (see page 3347, "Test Beverage"). The reference refers to komatsuna as *Brassica campestris*. *B. campestris* is synonymous with *B. rapa* (see <http://www.vplants.org/plants/species/species.jsp?gid=5442>). The reference does not specifically teach that the ingestion of the composition increases the amount of antioxidants in the blood. However, a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. The prior art process is structurally the same as the claimed process because both involve the ingestion of the same composition. This would inherently result in an increase the blood antioxidant activity if applicant's invention functions as claimed.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. Claims 29 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suido.

The teachings of this reference are discussed above. The reference does not specifically teach formulating the composition into all of the forms claimed by applicant. These pharmaceutical forms are well known in the art to be acceptable means of administering a pharmaceutically active substance. Based on this knowledge, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have had a reasonable expectation that formulating the composition taught by the references in the claimed forms would be successful. Therefore, an artisan of ordinary skill would have been motivated to formulate the composition taught by the reference in the forms claimed by applicant.

The reference also does not specifically teach adding the ingredients in the amounts claimed by applicant. The amount of a specific ingredient in a composition is clearly a result effective parameter that a person of ordinary skill in the art would routinely optimize. "[W]here the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation." In re Aller, 220 F.2d 454, 456, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955). The reference teaches that each of the claimed ingredients is a pharmaceutically active ingredient. An artisan of ordinary skill would routinely modify the amount of pharmaceutically active ingredients based on the patient's age, weight, gender, and

Art Unit: 1655

condition. Therefore, an artisan would have been motivated to modify the amount of each ingredient in the combination in order to formulate a product that best achieves the desired results set forth in the reference. Thus, absent some demonstration of unexpected results from the claimed parameters, this optimization of ingredient amount would have been obvious at the time of applicant's invention.

12. Claims 29 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suido in view of Lorenz (US 6,344,214).

The teachings of Suido are discussed above. The reference does not specifically teach including astaxanthin in this composition. However, the reference does teach using the vegetable composition for decreasing the levels of LDL cholesterol in the blood of patients. Lorenz teaches that administration of astaxanthin also decreases the levels of LDL cholesterol in patients. Thus, these references show that it was well known in the art at the time of the invention to use the claimed ingredients in methods to lower LDL cholesterol levels. It is well known that it is *prima facie* obvious to combine two or more ingredients each of which is taught by the prior art to be useful for the same purpose in order to form a third composition which is useful for the same purpose. The idea for combining them flows logically from their having been used individually in the prior art.

Based on the disclosure by these references that these substances are used in methods to lower LDL cholesterol levels, an artisan of ordinary skill would have a reasonable expectation that a combination of the substances would also be useful in creating a single method to lower LDL cholesterol levels. Therefore, the artisan would have been motivated to combine the claimed ingredients into a single composition for use in this method. No patentable invention

resides in combining old ingredients of known properties where the results obtained thereby are no more than the additive effect of the ingredients. See MPEP section 2144.06, In re Kerkhoven, 626 F.2d 846, 850, 205 USPQ 1069, 1072 (CCPA 1980), Ex parte Quadranti, 25 USPQ2d 1071 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1992).

13. No claims are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Susan Coe Hoffman whose telephone number is (571) 272-0963. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 8:30-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Terry McKelvey can be reached on (571) 272-0775. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 10/537,339  
Art Unit: 1655

Page 8

/Susan Coe Hoffman/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1655